

But notice that he claimed I removed the scar. I had nothing to do with it, didn't know Earl at that time and never knew he kept the cement core until he offered it to me about ten years ago before moving from Dallas. Using some common sense, if I were trying to keep the truth from coming out, as Livingstone suggests, I've had a decade to dispose of that "bullet scar" so no one would ever see it again. Instead, I saved the "evidence," have shown it to researchers and wrote of its existence. Besides, why would the brilliant assassination plotters leave behind proof of their crime when anyone could have drilled out that "scar" in a matter of minutes? Even more ridiculous is Livingstone's recommendation that I place the core in the National Archives. It is proof of nothing but careless construction. Livingstone believes there has been a government coverup and now he wants me to turn over hard evidence of a second gunman to the very people who could make it vanish!

To realize how absurd his theory really is, one need only diagram the trajectory. A bullet fired from the storm drain on the south end of the underpass would have passed over Kennedy at about Z-350, two seconds after the fatal head shot knocked him down, making another shot impossible and unnecessary.

As for the Bronson film and the acoustics evidence, I have written extensively about both in TFD for November 1993, March 1994 and July 1994. I own several film and tape copies of the Bronson film, but the original has always been either with Bronson's family or his attorney. I have continually pushed for the study and broadcast of the film since 1978, and well over a half million viewers in the Dallas and Boston areas have seen it.

Yes, there were antics at the 1992 JAMA conference. About an hour into the presentation, during the Q&A, JAMA's Rubin Mattel firmly admonished Livingstone by saying "You're here as a guest, this is a news conference. You do not have news credentials. We allowed you in. Now please behave yourself and you can stay."

When Livingstone needs an answer, but cannot find supporting evidence, he makes one up. For example, he links me and my acoustics theory with "close associate Robert Groden," even though we have not been friends or associates for several years. In fact, we never talked or met until the fall of 1978, long after the acoustics theory was brought to the HSCA's attention. It is both suspicious and disappointing to me that a select few in the critical community are so intent on destroying one of the

few pieces of hard evidence that can ever make a difference in this case. Every researcher ought to be pushing for further work until there is no doubt about the acoustics issue.

As for the veracity of Madeleine Brown, she was charged, tried by jury and convicted of forgery on November 11, 1992. The court of appeals reversed that conviction, apparently on a technicality in the original indictment, on January 19, 1995, months after my review had been submitted and days after the January 1995 TFD was mailed. Interested researchers can consult Criminal Case #F-9103481-L in Dallas County. Despite what Livingstone wrote, Madeleine's longtime friend Jim Marrs tells me he has no plans to write an article defending her. Livingstone either made that up, or she did.

Finally, Livingstone suggests I am afraid "of the new scientific information about to be published in my new book." Quite the contrary, Livingstone's "new" information that the Zapruder film has been altered, requires proof that the other three films of the head shot, Mix, Muchmore and Bronson, have likewise been changed yet still match each other. If that were possible, and it isn't, the perpetrators had to move all four original films in their possession that weekend before any copies were made. Yet Bronson didn't bring his film in for processing until Monday. Perhaps that's the real reason Livingstone wants you to think it doesn't show the head shot—it destroys his theory. When his book appears, the media will ask pro-conspiracy film maker Oliver Stone about the alteration theory and he'll just laugh. Maybe then Livingstone will behave himself.

—Gary Mack, 6646 E. Lovers Lane #604,
Dallas, TX 75214-1619